

### REMARKS

The above-listed amendments are fully supported by the Application as filed, in particular, claims 1-30 as filed. The amendments do not narrow the scope of the pending claims, but merely involve formalities, grammatical oversights/preferences, typological errors, and the like. These amendments to the claims are made solely to obtain expeditious allowance of the instant application. Amendment of the claims is made without prejudice and without intent to abandon any originally claimed subject matter and without intent to acquiesce in any rejection of record. Entry of the claim amendments is respectfully requested.

#### Specification Formalities

The Office Action mailed March 31, 2006 stated that the first paragraph concerning related applications should be amended to include the patent number of the parent application. Applicants have amended the specification to include a reference to U.S. Patent No. 6,716,979, as requested.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 10, 13, 20 and 23 were objected to because of the following formalities: in claims 10, 13 and 20 "chelating moiety" should be -chelating moiety-. In claim 23 "aomatic" should be -aromatic- and on line 2, "form a" should be -forms an- and after R<sup>42</sup> "form" should be -forms-. Each of the claims is amended accordingly.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 11, 15, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the use of phrases: "having a formula" and "comprising a formula." To overcome this rejection, the Office Action suggested changing the expressions to: "of the formula." Accordingly, each of claims 1, 11, 15 and 21 (claim 22 is canceled) have been amended to recite "of the formula" in place of "having a formula" or "comprising a formula." Applicants believe that in view of the amendments the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been rendered moot.

Double Patenting

Claim 22 is the only claim rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting, in view of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,716,979.

According to the Office Action, each of the claims dependent on rejected claims would be found allowable if cast in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the double patenting rejection, in order to obtain expeditious allowance claim 22 has been cancelled and claim 23 has been cast in independent form, including all the limitations of the parent claim. Claims 24-30, now depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 23 and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks, it is submitted that this application is now ready for allowance. Early notice to this effect is solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (541) 335-0165.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/28/06



Joel Silver  
Reg. No. 53,866

Molecular Probes, Inc.  
29851 Willow Creek Rd.  
Eugene, Oregon, 97402  
Phone: (541) 335-0165  
Facsimile: (541) 335-0354